VISION

"PRESERVING OUR VALUES, PROTECTING OUR FUTURE"

MISSION STATEMENT

Harford County, guided by common sense, accountability and compassion, strives to provide an outstanding living, working, educational, and recreational environment for al

GOALS FOR HARFORD COUNTY

I PRESERVE AND ENHANCE THE QUALITY OF LIFE

II SUPPORT A STRONG EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

III PROVIDE SAFE COMMUNITIES

IV IMPLEMENT SMART GROWTH

V SUSTAIN, EXPAND AND DIVERSIFY THE ECONOMY

VI OPERATE AN EFFICIENT, RESPONSIVE AND COMPASSIONATE GOVERNMENT

In 1996, Harford County became the first jurisdiction in the State to institute Performance Based Management through all levels of County Government. This budget is the latest step in our continuing efforts to provide needed services to our citizens in the most cost effective manner.

EXAMPLES OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Overall, the County departments and agencies, as well as the Board of Education, Harford Community College, the Libraries and the Health Department adopted a total of 317 Performance Measures in support of the County-wide Goals. A small sample of these measures are provided here as an example. The details of all measures and an explanation of the variance can be found in the County's Fiscal 2003-2004 Operating Budget Book.

I PRESERVE AND ENHANCE THE QUALITY OF LIFE

PARKS & RECREATION

BE RECEPTIVE TO THE INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE LEISURE NEEDS OF OUR COMMUNITIES THROUGH THE CREATION OF A DIVERSIFIED PROGRAM OF ACTIVITIES AND LEISURE OPPORTUNITIES

| Performance Measures | Actual FY 2001 | Actual FY 2002 | Target FY 2003 | Revised FY 2003 | Target FY 2004 |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| # of environmental/adventure programs | 290 | 460 | 486 | 375 | 494 |
| # of therapeutic recreation programs | 43 | 62 | 61 | 68 | 71 |
| # of programs for senior citizens | 279 | 352 | 353 | 361 | 374 |

II SUPPORT A STRONG EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

COUNTY EXECUTIVE

TO PROVIDE AN ANNUAL INCREASE IN THE COUNTY'S PER PUPIL SPENDING ON STUDENTS IN THE HARFORD COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM IN CONSIDERATION OF AVAILABLE REVENUES

| Budgeted | | Budgeted | Budgeted | Budgeted | Budgeted |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Performance Measures | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | FY 2003 | FY 2004 |
| Adjusted Enrollment | 37,282 | 37,701 | 37,950 | 38,814 | 39,221 |
| County Per Pupil Spending | \$3,531 | \$3,691 | \$3,913 | \$4,239 | \$4,350 |
| % change in County Per Pupil Spending | 2.53% | 4.53% | 6.01% | 8.33% | 2.62% |
| BOE Total County Funding | \$131,648,860 | \$139,157,403 | \$148,506,666 | \$164,517,408 | \$170,610,115 |
| % change in BOE Total County Funding | 3.09% | 5.70% | 6.72% | 10.78% | 3.70% |
| General Fund Budgets | \$293,379,113 | \$323,711,532 | \$341,174,621 | \$363,996,639 | \$352,127,812 |
| % change in County Op/Cap Gen Fund Budgets | 4.16% | 10.34% | 5.39% | 6.69% | -3.26% |

The State of Maryland produces an annual list of the Per Pupil Spending level of each Maryland County and Baltimore City, detailing how much they spend in each of twelve State Spending Categories, and how they rank according to the amount each spends in the aggregate. This report has some major flaws:

o The expenditures cited in the report were made two years previous.

This has led to a number of County Executives being criticized or praised for Per Pupil Spending efforts made by their predecessors.

o The data is based on what the school systems "spent" not on how much the local governments allocated.

In 1998 Harford County's School Administration purchased a new computerized business system. When numerous problems with both the payroll and accounts payable systems were discovered, the Board of Education decided to hold back on spending until they were resolved. This led to a \$5 million surplus for that year.

When the 2000 and 2001 State reports were published, County Executive Harkins received a great deal of criticism for Harford County's low ranking. This occurred despite the fact that those rankings were attributable to the prior administration, and the fluke in the school's automated business systems. In fact, for 2000 and 2001, the County Executive provided two of the largest increases in education funding in history. As a life-long conservative, the County Executive acted responsibly and made the difficult decision to raise taxes to provide increased salaries for teachers.

o The report's "facts" can be interpreted to support both sides of many arguments.

For example, while Harford County ranked low in per pupil spending, other reports which compared student achievement, placed us near the top State-wide. This led to different groups claiming:

1. that the County is not providing the school system with enough funding for the quality of work they do

2. that the County is spending its money wisely and getting a good return on its investment

o The report only includes expenditures made in twelve Categories, with no credit given for equipment, debt service or capital funding.

The twelve categories included have: seven directed to students and the classroom, Instructional Salaries, Other Instructional Costs, Special Education, Student Transportation, Student Personal Services, Health and Textbooks / Classroom Supplies; three directed to facilities, Operation and Maintenance of Plant and Fixed Charges; and two directed to supervisory expenses, Administration, and Mid-Level Administration.

Harford County's rankings in the classroom and facilities categories are closer to the middle of the State; and the lowest in administration, showing that this administration is keeping its commitment to directing funds to the classroom.

Only by including all the funds allocated by a subdivision can you truly define their commitment to education. In growing Counties, like Harford, citizens are demanding more schools. Such huge capital expenditures will benefit the system but do nothing to improve the County's Per Pupil Expenditure score. With the dismal national and State economies, Maryland Executives are faced with some extremely tough choices.

The Harkins' Administration, in its first four years in office has provided increased funding to the Board of Education in an amount almost double to what they received in the previous four years. The County Executive is committed to dealing with current school capacity and renovation issues. These will require massive amounts of capital funds and debt service payments. We intend to allocate available resources to meet these needs. BUT, we also intend to inform our citizens of our FULL commitment to education by publishing Harford County's true Per Pupil Spending data, which will include every dollar spent towards that end.

These Performance Measures display that commitment, even with an overall decrease in available General Funds, and faced with the demands of Federal and State unfunded mandates, plus the soaring costs of health care, increased funding has again been allocated to the Board of Education for FY 04.

LIBRARIES

ENSURE ACCESS TO AND THE AVAILABILITY OF A VARIETY OF TECHNOLOGICAL INFORMATION RESOURCE

| Performance Measures | Actual FY 2001 | Actual FY 2002 | Target FY 2003 | Revised FY 2003 | Target FY 2004 |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| # of personal computers for public access | 217 | 217 | 225 | 252 | 317 |
| # of citizens trained on use of on-line systems | 25,569 | 23,277 | 32,000 | 28,000 | 32,000 |
| # of data bases provided for public use | 21 | 28 | 30 | 32 | 32 |

III PROVIDE SAFE COMMUNITIES

COMMUNITY SERVICES

CONDUCT EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES FOR HARFORD COUNTY CITIZENS OF ALL AGES TO PROMOTE A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG ABUSE AND ADDICTIONS

| Performance Measures | Actual FY 2001 | Actual FY 2002 | Target FY 2003 | Revised FY 2003 | Target FY 2004 |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| # of educational programs | 75 | 69 | 75 | 70 | 70 |
| # of outreach/awareness efforts | 77 | 86 | 50 | 90 | 90 |
| # of treatment related referrals to support | | | | | |
| groups and therapy | 142 | 90 | 150 | 100 | 100 |

SHERIFF'S OFFICE

ESTABLISH EFFECTIVE POLICING PARTNERSHIPS BETWEEN LAW ENFORCEMENT AND LOCAL NEIGHBORHOOD COMMUNITIES

| Performance Measure | Actual | Actual | Target | Revised | Target |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | FY 2003 | FY 2003 | FY 2004 |
| # of communities with accepted Neighborhood Watch Programs | 86 | 119 | 92 | 119 | 122 |

COMBINE EFFORTS OF ALLIED LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES TO DETER DRUG CRIMES

| | Actual | Actual | Target | Revised | Target |
|--------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Performance Measures | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | FY 2003 | FY 2003 | FY 2004 |
| # of drug investigations | 325 | 325 | 300 | 300 | 445 |

IV IMPLEMENT SMART GROWTH

PLANNING & ZONING

RESEARCH METHODS TO IMPLEMENT LAND USE MECHANISMS CONSISTENT AND COMPATIBLE WITH THE STATE OF MARYLAND'S SMART GROWTH

| | Actual | Actual | Target | Revised | Target |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Performance Measure | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | FY 2003 | FY 2003 | FY 2004 |
| # of legislative recommendations prepared that are | | | | | |
| compatible with Maryland's Smart Growth initiative | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 4 |

INSPECTIONS, LICENSES & PERMITS

IDENTIFY, REMOVE OR REVITALIZE 80% OF ABANDONED STRUCTURES WITHIN THE ROUTE 40 CORRIDOR; I.E., HOT SPOT COMMUNITIES AND ABERDEEN AND EDGEWOOD ENTERPRISE ZONES

| | Actual | Actual | Target | Revised | Target |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Performance Measure | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | FY 2003 | FY 2003 | FY 2004 |
| Identify structures for compliance with | | | | | |
| applicable code | 70% | 73% | 75% | 78% | 80% |

V SUSTAIN, EXPAND AND DIVERSIFY THE ECONOMY

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

CREATE AN ENVIRONMENT FOR GROWTH OF TECHNOLOGY COMPANIES ALONG THE I-95/ROUTE 40 CORRIDOR

| | Actual | Actual | Target | Revised | Target |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Performance Measures | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | FY 2003 | FY 2003 | FY 2004 |
| # of new and expanding technology firms/defense | | | | | |
| contractors | 4 | 12 | 10 | 11 | 11 |
| # of new and expanding technology companies | | | | | |
| at HEAT/Rt 40 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| # of new jobs createc | 319 | 222 | 150 | 150 | 175 |
| # of technology related conferences. | | | | | |
| symposiums | 3 | 3 | 10 | 2 | 3 |

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

CREATE OPPORTUNITIES FOR QUALIFIED RESIDENT BUSINESSES, INCLUDING INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL/RETAIL/SERVICE TO APPLY FOR POTENTIAL ENTERPRISE ZONE TAX CREDITS BY DEVELOPING NEW JOBS, CONSTRUCTING NEW FACILITIES, EXPANDING OR REVITALIZING EXISTING FACILITIES

| | Actual | Actual | Target | Revised | Target |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Performance Measures | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | FY 2003 | FY 2003 | FY 2004 |
| # of businesses obtaining Enterprise Zone | | | | | |
| real property and/or income tax credits | 20 | 20 | 40 | 25 | 25 |
| Capital Investments | \$81.8M | \$10.7M | \$50M | \$50M | \$25M |
| # of full-time jobs created | 574 | 89 | 750 | 350 | 300 |
| # of part-time jobs created | 53 | 54 | 100 | 50 | 50 |

VI OPERATE AN EFFICIENT, RESPONSIVE AND COMPASSIONATE GOVERNMENT

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENTAL AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS

PROVIDE TIMELY AND THOROUGH RESPONSE TO CITIZENS' REQUESTS AND ACT AS AN EFFECTIVE LIAISON TO ALL GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES AND CITIZENS' GROUPS

| | Actual | Actual | Target | Revised | Target |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Performance Measure | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | FY 2003 | FY 2003 | FY 2004 |
| Citizen inquiries/requests: | | | | | |
| # received | 2,000 | 2,100 | 2,250 | 2,250 | 2,300 |
| % responded to immediately or within 1 day | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

PUBLIC WORKS - WATER & SEWER

CONTINUE TO RESPOND TO WATER EMERGENCIES WITHIN 20 MINUTES, 24 HOURS A DAY, 365 DAYS A YEAR

| Performance Measure | Actual | Actual | Target | Revised | Target |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | FY 2003 | FY 2003 | FY 2004 |
| % of response time not exceeding 20 minutes | 92% | 92% | 92% | 92% | 92% |